



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,135	08/08/2001	B. Arlen Young	ADPT1052	5885

7590 05/12/2004
Forrest Gunnison
Gunnison, McKay & Hodgson, L.L.P.
Suite 220
1900 Garden Road
Monterey, CA 93940

EXAMINER

CORRIELUS, JEAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2004

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/925,135

Applicant(s)

YOUNG, B. ARLEN

Examiner

Jean M Corrielus

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2172

DETAILED ACTION

1. This first office action is in response to the application filed on August 8, 2001, in which claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

Drawings

2. Applicants are required to furnish the formal drawings in response this office action. No new matter may be introduced in the required drawing. Failure to timely submit a drawing will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application. (See attachment for PTO-948).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liong US

Patent no. 6,665,746 in view of Holt et al., (hereinafter "Holt") US Patent no. 6,105,080.

As to claim 1, Liong discloses the claimed "a plurality of scatter/gather list sections stored in a memory" (col.2, lines 10-25); "wherein at least one scatter/gather list section" (col.2, lines 28-40); and "a plurality of data elements" (col.6, lines 14-60). However, Liong does not explicitly disclose the claimed "an end-of-list flag"; and "an end-of-section flag".

Holt, On the other hand, discloses the claimed “an end-of-list flag” (col.3, lines 57-64); and “an end-of-section flag” (col.3, lines 57-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing, at the time the present invention was made to modify Liong’s system, wherein the execution scatter/gather operation (see Liong’s fig.5, item 502 would incorporate the use of a end-of list flag and end-of section flag, in the same conventional manner as suggested by Holt (col.3, lines 57-64). One having would have been motivated to utilize such modification in order to automatically transmit reply message to requesting host system without intervention from a general purpose processor of the host adapter, thereby avoiding unnecessary distraction.

As to claim 2, Holt discloses the claimed “said end-of-list flag has a same value in said each data element” (col.3 lines , 57-64; col.4, lines 2-25).

As to claim 3, Holt discloses the claimed “wherein said end-of-section flag has a same value in said each data element” (col.3 lines , 57-64; col.4, lines 2-25).

As to claim 4, Holt discloses the claimed “wherein said end-of-section flag has a first value in a last data element in said plurality of data elements, and a second value in all other data elements in said plurality of data elements” (col.3 lines 57-64; col.4, lines 2-25).

As to claim 5, Holt discloses the claimed “wherein said end-of-list flag has a same value in said each- data element” (col.3 lines 57-64; col.4, lines 2-25).

As to claim 6, Holt discloses the claimed “wherein said end-of-list flag has a first value in said last data element in said plurality of data elements, and a second value in all other data elements in said plurality of data elements” (col.3 lines , 57-64; col.4, lines 2-25).

As to claim 7, Holt discloses the claimed “said end-of-list flag has a size of one bit” (col.3 lines , 57-64; col.4, lines 2-25).

As to claim 8, Holt discloses the claimed “wherein said end-of-section flag has a size of one bit” (col.3 lines , 57-64; col.4, lines 2-25).

As to claim 9, Liong discloses the claimed “an address field” (col.6, lines 25-60).

As to claim 10, Holt discloses the claimed “wherein said end-of-list flag, and said end-of-section flag are included within said address field” (col.3 lines , 57-64; col.4, lines 2-25).

As to claim 11, Liong discloses the claimed “a length field”(col.7, lines 5-65; col.8, lines 30-67; col.10, lines 20-63).

As to claim 12, Liong discloses the claimed “a length field” (col.7, lines 5-65; col.8, lines 30-67; col.10, lines 20-63).

As to claim 13, Holt discloses the claimed "an end-of-list flag" (col.3 lines , 57-64; col.4, lines 2-25).; and "an end-of-section flag" (col.3 lines , 57-64; col.4, lines 2-25).

As to claims 14-21, the limitations of claims 14-21 have been noted in the rejection of claims 1-13 above. They are, therefore, rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean M. Corrielus whose telephone number is (703) 306-3035. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (12:00pm - 7:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jean M. Corrielus

Patent Examiner

May 8, 2004